## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/531,477	KULA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

<del>-</del>					
	WEIPING ZHU	1793			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 17 April 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.  1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time					
periods:  a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL					
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because  (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).					
<ul> <li>7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 2-6. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:</li> </ul>					
<ul> <li>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</li> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ul>					
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea , and was not earlier presented. Se	ıl and/or appellant fail: ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a ).		
<ul> <li>10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> <li>11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu of the reasons as stated in the final rejection.</li> </ul>		•			
<ul> <li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).</li> <li>13. ☐ Other: See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ul>	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)				
/Roy King/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793					

Continuation of 13. Other: The claims 2-6 are currently under examination, wherein claim 2 has been amended in applicant's amendment filed April 17, 2008. All the previous rejection of claims 2-6 as stated in the Office action dated January 17, 2008 are maintained. With respect to the amended feature of claim 2, the reasons for the rejection of claim 2 as stated in the Office action dated January 17, 2008 can be properly applied. The following responses are to applicant's new arguments incurred from the final Office action dated January 17, 2008.

Applicant's argues that both Kubota ('540) and Stickels et al. ('599) describe the simultaneous introduction of a nitrogen carrier and a carbon carrier for carbonitriding and the references would not have provided one of ordinary skill in the art with any reason or rational to have derived the claimed process through optimization of the processes of Kubota ('540) and Stickels et al. ('599). The examiner notes that the rejection was based on the prior art's broad disclosure rather than preferred embodiments. See MPEP 2123. Kubota ('540) does not specify simultaneously introducing a nitrogen carrier and a carbon carrier for carbonitriding as asserted by the applicant by stating that nitrogen is penetrated into the surface of the steel material at the same time as carbon in a carbonitriding treatment (col. 3, lines 30-36). Stickels et al. ('599) actually teaches away from nitriding at either the temperatures below 1100 degrees F (593 degrees C) or the temperatures at which the steel is in an austenitic condition (i.e. the carburizing temperature) (col. 1, lines 34-43). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the nitriding temperature range is a result effective variable as stated in the Office action dated January 17, 2008. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to optimize the nitriding temperature range in order to achieve the desired nitrogen content, nitrogen penetration depth and the resulting residual compressive stress in the surface region of the steel workpiece.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Weiping Zhu whose telephone number is 571-272-6725. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-16:30 Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on 571-272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.